United Nations

A/C.1/52/PV.21

# General Assembly

Fifty-second session

*Official Records*

## First Committee

**21**st Meeting

Wednesday, 12 November 1997, 3 p.m.

New York

*Chairman:* Mr. Nkgowe . . . . . (Botswana)

*The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.*

**Agenda items 62 to 83** (*continued*)

**Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items**

**The Chairman:** As I informed members of the Committee at our meeting this morning, the Committee will proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions A/C.1/52/L.39/Rev.1, L.8/Rev.1 and those draft resolutions which appear in clusters 7, 8, 9 and 10, except A/C.1/52/L.3, L.11/Rev.1, L.36 and L.42.

Before the Committee proceeds to take decisions on draft resolution L.39/Rev.1, I will call upon those representatives wishing to introduce revised draft resolutions.

**Mr. Akram** (Pakistan): As the Committee will have noticed, A/C.1/52/L.39/Rev.1 has been circulated. It contains just two small changes. In the seventh preambular paragraph, after "Taking note of the recent proposals for disarmament", the words "and nuclear non-proliferation" have been deleted. In the penultimate line of the ninth preambular paragraph, in the phrase which read "would enhance the security of smaller States", the word "smaller" has been changed to "all".

These are the only two changes that have been made in this draft resolution, and given these changes it is the expectation of the sponsors that the draft resolution could be adopted without a vote. I sincerely hope that this will be the case.

**The Chairman:** If no other representatives wish to take the floor at this stage, I will give the floor those members of the Committee wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.39/Rev.1.

As I see none, the Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution L.39/Rev.1.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.39/Rev.1, entitled "Regional disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 16th meeting, on 6 November 1997. The draft resolution was sponsored by those countries listed in the draft itself and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2.

**The Chairman:** The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.39/Rev.1 was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** I will now give the floor to those representatives wishing to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

If no one wishes to take the floor, the Committee will proceed to consider draft resolution L.8/Rev.1.

I now give the floor to those members of the Committee wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution L.8/Rev.1.

97-86497 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

**Mr. Mallam Daouda** (Niger) (*interpretation from French*): The draft resolution in document A/C.1/52/L.8/Rev.1, on assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them, is the simplest of the draft resolutions submitted to the First Committee. Indeed, it has no political implications. If in certain parts of the world small arms are used for hunting, this is not true in Africa, and particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, where, as we have already said, they are used to kill women, children and men of all ages. Given my comments, I request the Committee to vote overwhelmingly in favour of the draft resolution.

**The Chairman**: Are there other delegations wishing to take the floor at this stage? I see none.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.8/Rev.1.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.8/Rev.1, entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them", was introduced by the representative of Mali at the 16th meeting, on 6 November 1997. In addition to those countries listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2, the draft resolution is also sponsored by Haiti.

**The Chairman**: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.8/Rev.1 was adopted.*

**The Chairman**: The Committee will now turn to the draft resolutions in cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery". I call upon delegations wishing to make general statements other than explanations of their position or vote on the draft resolutions contained in that cluster.

**Mr. de Icaza** (Mexico)(*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to say a few words on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.16. When we were working on this draft resolution, the 1996 *United Nations Disarmament Yearbook* had not been distributed. Since then, fortunately, the Secretariat has been kind enough to distribute that important volume. In view of this, and because some delegations have since contacted us to observe that the language in the last preambular paragraph of the draft resolution is a bit too strong, reading:

> "*Noting with concern* the delay in the publication of the 1996 *United Nations Disarmament Yearbook*",

we propose to delete the term "with concern". The last preambular paragraph of draft resolution L.16 would then read:

> "*Noting* the delay in the publication of the 1996 *United Nations Disarmament Yearbook*".

With this change, we hope that draft resolution L.16 can be adopted without a vote.

**Mr. Millim** (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): It is my honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia and the associated country, Cyprus — align themselves with this statement. The countries associated with the European economic area, Iceland and Norway, also align themselves with this statement.

Following a decision of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General's reform programme has been considered in plenary meeting under the leadership of the President of the Assembly, who specifically requested the Committee to ensure that its activities did not duplicate the work of the Assembly.

With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.42, the European Union has adopted the position of principle that the submission of that draft resolution in the First Committee, independent from the discussion of its substantive merits, risks seriously disturbing the integrated and smooth conduct of the consideration of the proposals of the Secretary-General.

In that light, the European Union would urgently appeal to the sponsors of the draft resolution to withdraw it. If draft resolution L.42 were to be put to a vote, the European Union would vote as a bloc against it.

**Mr. Akram** (Pakistan): I would like to make a few general remarks on this cluster of draft resolutions and focus in particular on the draft we consider to be the most important in this cluster, namely, draft resolution

A/C.1/52/L.42, dealing with the question of the role of the United Nations in the field of disarmament.

I would like to emphasize, as we have done earlier, that draft resolution L.42 is not designed in any way to intervene in or interfere with the process of the reform that is being conducted by the Secretary-General and that is being considered in the plenary of the General Assembly. We believe, however, that in this phase of the work of the United Nations in the field of disarmament, which is almost 8 years after the end of the cold war, it is necessary for the General Assembly to reaffirm the broad parameters of the efforts that are being made in the main machinery that has been established, which is the First Committee, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament, of course, with the help of the Secretariat.

Such a reaffirmation, we believe, would reinforce and strengthen the process of reform being conducted by the Secretary-General and would give a sense of direction to the work that is conducted in the inter-governmental organizations, including this Committee, the Disarmament Commission and, especially, the Conference on Disarmament.

The sponsors of A/C.1/52/L.42, having been advised privately of the concerns that have just been expressed by the representative of the European Union, have considered the text and have decided to assuage such concerns by deleting the first preambular paragraph of L.42, which is the only reference in this draft resolution to the restructuring of the United Nations Secretariat and the report of the Secretary-General [A/51/950]. With this deletion, the draft resolution will stand on its own and is totally independent of the reform process that is being conducted in plenary.

If this draft resolution is read without the first preambular paragraph, the Committee will note that its provisions reflect only the agreed positions and decisions of the General Assembly, and thus it is our expectation that these provisions will create no difficulty, procedural or substantive, for any delegation in the General Assembly. It is our hope that with this revision, all delegations in the Committee will find it possible both to consider this draft resolution and to vote in its favour.

**Mr. de Icaza** (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to place on record the importance that it attaches to the draft resolution in document A/C.1/52/L.42. Of course, at no time did we seek to influence in any way the analysis or consideration of the Secretary-General's programme for reform.

We believe this draft resolution has something important to say with regard to the role of the United Nations in disarmament and to the implementation of recommendations and decisions adopted by consensus by the General Assembly at its tenth special session. I feel that this draft resolution is not only valuable in itself; it is also a reaffirmation of what the Assembly itself has already decided, and decided by consensus, and it should remain valid until other consensus resolutions are approved.

We are not unaware of the fact that there have been discussions about the durability of the validity of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly [resolution S-10/2] as regards the disarmament priorities contained therein. But what was agreed by consensus is still valid until that consensus is replaced by something else. We believe that this draft resolution is of paramount importance in a year in which international public opinion may, at the very least, be somewhat surprised or perplexed by the scant progress made multilaterally in the disarmament field in the United Nations.

Of course, my delegation fully agrees with deleting the first preambular paragraph and would not understand, or would understand far too well, how someone could not support the draft resolution once that preambular paragraph has been deleted.

**The Chairman**: Are there other delegations wishing to make general statements other than explanations of their position or vote on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 7?

I will now give the floor to those members of the Committee wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.16. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.16.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.16, entitled "United Nations Disarmament Information Programme", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 17th meeting, on 7 November 1997. The draft resolution is sponsored by those

countries listed in the draft resolution itself and document A/C.1/52/INF/2.

At this afternoon's meeting the representative of Mexico made an oral revision in the last preambular paragraph, namely, after "Noting", delete the words "with concern".

**The Chairman**: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed their wish that the draft resolution, as orally revised, be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.16, as orally revised, was adopted.*

**The Chairman**: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote on the draft resolution just adopted. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to consider draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.20.

I give the floor to those members of the Committee wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.20. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.20.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.20, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Sri Lanka at the 16th meeting, on 6 November 1997. In addition to those countries listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2, it is also sponsored by Ecuador.

**The Chairman:** The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.20?

*Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.20 was adopted.*

**The Chairman**: I will now give the floor to those delegations who wish to explain their position or vote after the decision. I see none.

The Committee will proceed to consider draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.21.

I first give the floor to those members of the Committee who wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on the draft resolution. I see none.

The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.21.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.21, entitled "Report of the Disarmament Commission", was introduced by the representative of Colombia at the 15th meeting, on 5 November 1997. The draft resolution is sponsored by those countries listed in the draft itself.

**The Chairman**: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.21?

*Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.21 was adopted.*

**The Chairman**: I shall now give the floor to those delegations who wish to explain their position or vote after the decision. I see none.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make general statements other than explanation of their position or vote on draft resolutions contained in cluster 8. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to consider draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.9.

I shall first give the floor to those members of the Committee who wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on the draft resolution. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.9. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.9, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia at the 16th

meeting, on 6 November 1997. The draft resolution is sponsored by those countries listed in the draft itself and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2.

**The Chairman**: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.9?

*Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.9 was adopted.*

**The Chairman**: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position or vote after the decision.

**Mr. Grey** (United States): I request that the record of today's proceedings reflect that the United States did not participate in the consensus on resolution A/C.1/52/L.9, which asserts a relationship between disarmament and development. We believe that disarmament and development are two distinct issues which simply do not lend themselves to being linked. It was for this reason that the United States did not participate in the 1987 conference on this matter.

My delegation would like to take this opportunity to state again that the United States does not and will not consider itself bound by the declarations in the Final Document of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development.

**Mr. Millim** (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The countries of Central and Eastern Europe associated with the European Union, namely, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and the associated country of Cyprus all align themselves with this explanation of vote, as does Iceland, a member country of the European economic area.

The member States of the European Union have again reached consensus on the draft contained in A/C.1/52/L.9, entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development", and we would like to make a few clarifications.

Though we acknowledge the considerable advantages that may flow from disarmament, the European Union considers that there is no direct and automatic linkage between, on the one hand, commitments entered into by the European Union regarding economic and social development and development assistance and, on the other, savings realized elsewhere, including in the area of disarmament.

We would also like to emphasize the commitment of the European Union in this regard and point out that the assistance provided by the European Union and its member States to the developing countries represents approximately 40 per cent of all international assistance for development.

**Mr. Danieli** (Israel): Israel has joined the consensus on this resolution. At the same time, Israel dissociates itself from the provisions and contents of the Final Document of the Eleventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Cartagena de Indias, Colombia, in October 1995, and does not see itself as part of the recommendations contained therein.

**The Chairman**: If there are no other delegations wishing to take the floor at this stage, the Committee will proceed to consider draft resolution A/C.1/L.10/Rev.1.

I now give the floor to those members of the Committee who wish to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on the draft resolution. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.10/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia at the 16th meeting, on 6 November 1997. The draft resolution was sponsored by those countries listed in the draft itself and document A/C.1/52/INF/2.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica,

Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:

None

*Abstaining*:

France, Israel, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Liberia, Monaco, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted by 138 votes to none, with 8 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of Liberia and Jordan informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

**The Chairman:** I shall now give the floor to those delegations wishing to explain their votes.

**Mr. Sun** (Republic of Korea): My delegation has voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.10/Rev.1, entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control". My delegation is of the view this year's draft resolution duly reflects the ongoing international efforts to incorporate environmental norms into disarmament and arms control agreements. We believe that the observance of environmental norms in the field of disarmament will contribute to global efforts to preserve the environment and to make the earth a safer and cleaner place to live.

Last my delegation abstained in the voting on the relevant draft resolution because it dealt only with certain disarmament agreements and contained certain unnecessary provisions which might lead to a wrong interpretation of the entire draft resolution and impair its well-motivated objectives and principles.

This year, however, my delegation has concluded that significant improvements have been made in the present draft resolution and that the problems which prevented my delegation from supporting last year's draft have been rectified. It is for this reason that my delegation has changed the position of abstention that it took last year and voted in favour of the draft resolution this year.

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.12. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.12, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia at the 16th meeting on 6 November 1997. The draft resolution was sponsored by Colombia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour*:

Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Georgia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Japan,

Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against*:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining*:

Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Turkey

*The draft resolution was adopted by 104 votes to 3, with 38 abstentions.*

[Subsequently, the delegations of the Dominican Republic and Jordan informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Albania had intended to abstain.]

**The Chairman:** I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their votes.

**Mr. Grey** (United States of America): As has been the case for many years, the United States again this year was compelled to vote against the draft resolution on "Implementation of the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace".

This draft resolution, like its predecessors, does not meet the requirements necessary to warrant our support. It fails to recognize the navigational rights and freedoms protected under customary international law, as reflected in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. In our view, freedom of overflight, rights of innocent passage through territorial seas, transit passage through international straits and archipelagic sea-lanes passage must be explicitly acknowledged in this resolution in addition to acknowledging freedom of navigation on the high seas. Absent such acknowledgments, the United States cannot and will not support any resolutions along the lines of this draft.

Furthermore, we remain concerned by the financial burden placed on the United Nations by the continued existence of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean. In a budgetary environment marked by retrenchment across the board, the United Nations cannot afford to support bodies that no longer serve any useful purpose.

No one denies that the issues of security and the peaceful resolution of disputes in the Indian Ocean region are important. The question is how best to address them effectively in a financially responsible manner. As the United States noted last year, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean is the only such group that meets under the auspices and budget of the United Nations. This should stop. The regional participants should identify an appropriate regional forum for their substantive discussions.

**The Chairman:** The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.14. A recorded vote has been requested.

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.14, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament", was introduced by the representative of India at the 17th meeting, on 7 November 1997. The draft resolution was sponsored by those countries listed in the draft itself and document A/C.1/52/INF/2.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic,

Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:*

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Abstaining:*

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Georgia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Marshall Islands, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Samoa, South Africa, Turkmenistan, Ukraine

*Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.14 was adopted by 88 votes to 42, with 17 abstentions*

**The Chairman:** I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote after the decision.

**Mr. Fu Zhigang** (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.14, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament".

China is concerned about the negative impact that military applications of science and technology may have on international peace and security. It supports the efforts by the international community to strengthen the international non-proliferation regime, and it endorses the implementation of stringent non-proliferation measures for weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear, biological and chemical weapons.

At the same time, the Chinese delegation firmly believes that the existing discriminatory and exclusive export control regimes and arrangements must be overhauled and revamped. An export control regime for dual-use technologies and equipment must be established through the broad participation of the international community.

No non-proliferation measure should hinder international cooperation on the peaceful uses of science and technology. All countries must follow the procedures set forth in the international legal instruments, including using dialogue and cooperation to remove any concerns regarding proliferation, so as to achieve the common objective of international non-proliferation.

As much as China is concerned about the application of advanced science and technology in the development of weapons of mass destruction, it is equally — indeed, more — concerned about its application in the development of outer-space weapons, such as anti-satellite weapons and the so-called theatre missile defence systems. Seen from this perspective, the application of military science and technology has the same significance for both conventional weapons and those of mass destruction. For this reason, we believe that the wording in the second preambular paragraph of this draft resolution could be improved.

**The Chairman:** If there are no further speakers in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.14, I will now call upon those delegations wishing to make general statements other than explanation of position or vote on draft resolutions contained in cluster 9. I see none.

I call on those members of the Committee wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.18. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.18.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.18, entitled "Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures", was introduced by the representative of Germany at the 16th

meeting, on 6 November 1997. In addition to those countries listed in the draft resolution itself and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2, the draft resolution is sponsored by Iceland, Slovakia and Bulgaria.

**The Chairman:** The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.18 was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** I call on those delegations wishing to explain their position after the decision. I see none.

I now call on those delegations wishing to make general statements other than explanation of their position or vote on draft resolutions contained in cluster 10. I see none.

I now call on those members of the Committee wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/52/L.13. I see none.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft decision A/C.1/52/L.13.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft decision A/C.1/52/L.13, entitled "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", was introduced by the representative of Indonesia at the 16th meeting of the Committee on 6 November 1997.

The draft decision was sponsored by Colombia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:*

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

*Against:* None

*Abstaining:*

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

*Draft decision A/C.1/52/L.13 was adopted by 96 votes to none, with 48 abstentions*

**The Chairman:** As no representatives wish to explain their vote or position, we have finished taking action on those draft resolutions that were ready for this afternoon. We cannot, unfortunately, take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.34, because the sponsor is not here this afternoon. However, if the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45 are ready, we can take action on it now.

**Ms. Laker** (Canada): On behalf of Poland, Canada would like to ask that the Committee take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45 this afternoon.

**The Chairman**: We will therefore take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45.

**The Chairman**: There being no members of the Committee wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45, the Committee will now take action on the draft resolution.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45, entitled "Status of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction", was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 17th meeting of the Committee on 7 November 1997.

The draft resolution was sponsored by those countries listed in the draft.

**The Chairman:** The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt it without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45 was adopted.*

**The Chairman:** I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position on the draft resolution just adopted.

**Mr. Abou-Hadid** (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45, entitled "Status of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction". Had the draft resolution been put to the vote, my delegation would have abstained because the final text of the Convention does not take account of the observations made by the Arab States. Our position is based on the following considerations.

The Convention lacks adequate procedures for ensuring that the verification system is not misused through challenges to it. The Convention does not state explicitly that its implementation will not be an obstacle or impediment to the economic and technological development of the parties, especially developing countries parties. Notably, in that regard, the Convention does not set out comprehensive safeguards to deter the use or threat of use of chemical weapons against any party to the Convention. We consider this to be a shortcoming in the Convention — as it is in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which has not achieved universality 25 years after its entry into force. One well known reason for this shortcoming relates to safeguards.

For States, national security is an indivisible integral whole. All types of threats to security should be addressed equally in terms of seriousness and of the proper balance of the constituent elements of national security.

Here, the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament set out the priorities of disarmament. The top priority is nuclear weapons, since, because of their uniquely vast destructive effects, these pose the most serious threat to the very future of mankind.

In the light of those considerations, the Arab States understood this many years ago and renounced the nuclear option. They have become convinced of the serious threat posed to the Middle East by the nuclear-arms race in the light of the acute tensions that assail the region and the failure thus far to find just and comprehensive solutions to the numerous problems there. These risks continue to imperil the security of the States of the region.

The Arab States, my country included, have thus taken the initiative to support efforts to make the Middle East into a nuclear-weapon-free zone. The majority of the States of the region have joined in this endeavour — in fact, all but one: Israel, which remains outside the framework of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and refuses to accede to that Treaty. Its refusal is based on all manner of pretexts. Sometimes it invokes the peace process, which began 20 years after the entry into force of the NPT.

It has become common when we vote on draft resolutions on nuclear-weapon-free zones to hear from the representative of the one State in the region that has yet to accede to the NPT. That State refuses to subject all its nuclear installations to the comprehensive safeguards system of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

The Syrian Arab Republic and the other Arab States of the region have thus firmly supported the establishment of the Middle East as a region free of all weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons, which are the most dangerous of all.

**Mr. Akram** (Pakistan): I wish to explain the reasons why, and the context within which, Pakistan has been able to support draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45, on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development,

Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction. Despite our concerns and reservations regarding certain provisions of the Chemical Weapons Convention, which we articulated at the time the Convention was adopted as well as subsequently, Pakistan signed the Convention to underscore its commitment to the objective of the complete elimination, regionally and globally, of this abhorrent means of warfare. In order to promote this basic objective in our region, we also entered into a solemn declaration on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons in South Asia.

The entry into force of the Convention revealed the unpleasant reality of the presence of chemical-weapons stockpiles and production facilities designed to be used against Pakistan. This situation created a qualitatively new situation for Pakistan and complicated our decision as regards the ratification of the Convention. Our concerns were highlighted in the statement made by my Minister of State for Foreign Affairs in the general debate in this Committee.

Despite these challenges, I take great satisfaction in announcing in this Committee that, following a bold decision taken by the Government of Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, Pakistan submitted its instrument of ratification to the Chemical Weapons Convention on 28 October 1997. We will therefore attend the Second Conference of States Parties, to be held at The Hague early next month, as a State party. Pakistan's decision is a vote of confidence in the international community and in the collective contribution that it can and should make to advance the cause of peace and security on an equitable and non-discriminatory basis.

It also represents a practical manifestation of Pakistan's sincerity in pursuing the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction. Pakistan has joined the Convention in the hope that it will be implemented in a fair and equitable manner and that it will serve to alleviate the genuine security concerns of all States, especially the non-possessors of chemical weapons.

**Mr. Zahran** (Egypt): Egypt has traditionally supported all measures designed to contribute to the promotion of international and regional stability and has always committed itself to engage in constructive actions in the fulfilment of this objective.

It is in this spirit that we cannot but sympathize with the general thrust of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.45, as the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (CWC) entered into the force on 29 April 1997. I should like to recall that we worked diligently among other delegations in order to elaborate a watertight Convention.

We firmly believe that a good and balanced Convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons would be a step forward, paving the way for the implementation of President Mubarak's initiative of April 1990, which called for declaring the Middle East a region free from all weapons of mass destruction, under effective international control. The said initiative is intended to involve all weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear, chemical and biological weapons.

The CWC, together with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction (BWC), are considered to be three pillars on which the said zone should be established. Hence, from the regional perspective, we cannot dissociate the CWC from the NPT and the BWC. We are of the strong conviction that all States of the region should bear equal and reciprocal obligations deriving from the three aforementioned international instruments governing weapons of mass destruction all together. Sharing in good faith such common responsibility would contribute to confidence-building and thus greatly enhance peace and stability in the Middle East.

Israel remains the only State in the Middle East that has not yet adhered to the NPT. Furthermore, Israel is the only State in the region that operates nuclear facilities that are not under the full-scope safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Ridding the Middle East of all weapons of mass destruction by the adherence of all States of the region, without exception or double standards, to the NPT, CWC and BWC would constitute a positive contribution, as well as a confidence-building measure.

It is for these reasons that we do not consider ourselves part of the consensus that led to the adoption of this draft resolution. Furthermore, Egypt would have abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.45 if it had been put to the vote.

**Mr. Danieli** (Israel): Israel has joined the consensus on this draft resolution. Furthermore, Israel recently joined the community of nations in welcoming the entry into force of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development,

Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (CWC).

Israel is proud to have been one of the original founding signatory States of the Convention. Our signature of the Convention and, subsequently, the active role that we took in the joint endeavour to craft it into workable mechanisms, reflect in general Israel's vision of the world in which it wishes to exist and prosper — in particular, its continuing interest, which is shared by many other countries, in preserving the Convention's core balance between a State's duty to demonstrate compliance and its right to protect itself from intrusive and abusive encroachment on its security and its commercial and proprietary interests.

By signing the Convention, Israel signalled its hope that others in its region would soon follow suit. Israel belongs to those Member States that have not yet ratified the Convention. This should come as no surprise to the world community, which is cognizant of the unique strategic and political environment in which Israel still operates today. At the signing ceremony in Paris in 1993, Israel's Foreign Minister openly stated Israel's position that

> "the Chemical Weapons Convention must refer to our region and ... the region at large must adhere to its principles".

In that context, Israel then made it clear that it would seek to ratify the Convention subject to its regional concerns as well as to its constitutional constraints and legislative timetable.

These considerations remain no less valid today. Israel is aware of — indeed, it welcomes — the fact that certain Arab States have signed or even ratified the Convention. However, it is, unfortunately, also a well-known reality that none of the chemical-weapons-capable or suspected chemical-weapons-armed Arab States have signed, let alone ratified, the Chemical Weapons Convention. Indeed, key non-signatory Arab States have indicated collectively that they would not change their position even if Israel were to ratify the Convention. Among them are countries which, in the past, have resorted to the use of chemical weapons and are believed to be developing capabilities in this field even as the world is pledging to forsake and eradicate forever all chemical weapons. From Israel's perspective, not only have chemical-weapons threats against it not receded in recent years; they have even gained in saliency and acuteness.

What I have stated must not be construed as prejudging the outcome of a future Israeli decision on the matter of ratification or of the continued Israeli support of the Convention. Favourable changes in the security climate will, of course, favourably affect Israel's attitude on the ratification issue.

**Mr. Rao** (India): I take the floor to explain our position.

India has consistently favoured the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction on the basis of multilaterally negotiated, comprehensive and non-discriminatory agreements. In keeping with our commitment, we take satisfaction in being an original State Party to and fulfilling our obligations deriving from the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (CWC). We urge all States to implement all provisions of the Chemical Weapons Convention with an equal degree of transparency and commitment.

We welcome the launching of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW). We believe that issues relating to implementation are best discussed in forums of the OPCW, an organization set up exclusively to deal with the implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention. We also believe that, now that the CWC has its own organizational set-up, it would be appropriate for the organization to consult on a draft resolution for the General Assembly in future years.

**The Chairman**: Are there other delegations wishing to speak to explain their position or vote after the decision was taken? There are none.

I understand we can now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.34/Rev.1.

I will now call on those members of the Committee wishing to explain their position or vote before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.34/Rev.1.

**Mr. Shevchenko** (Ukraine): Ukraine attaches great importance to the strengthening of international peace, security and stability at global and regional levels. We believe that the development of good-neighbourly relations among States is one of the effective ways to achieve this goal. A number of agreements concluded recently by my country with neighbouring States could be regarded in this context. Therefore, we fully share the main thrust of draft

resolution A/C.1/52/L.34/Rev.1, presented by the delegation of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

**The Chairman**: If there are no further delegations wishing to speak, the Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.34/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

**Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung** (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.34/Rev.1, entitled "Development of good-neighbourly relations among Balkan States", was introduced by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia at the 17th meeting, on 7 November 1997. In addition to those countries listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2, it is also co-sponsored by Albania, Canada and Ukraine.

**The Chairman**: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

*Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.34/Rev.1 was adopted.*

**The Chairman**: I will now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position after the decision. I see none.

That concludes the draft resolutions on which we could take action. There are still draft resolutions on which we are going to take action but which are not ready yet. In cluster 1 we have draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1; in cluster 4, L.27/Rev.1; in cluster 6, L.2, L.6 and L.43; in cluster 7, L.3, L.11/Rev.1 and L.42; and in cluster 10, L.36.

I propose that tomorrow morning we take action on draft resolutions L.27/Rev.1, L.6, L.11/Rev.1, L.42 and L.36/Rev.1. I would really appeal to delegations to submit to the Secretariat any other draft resolutions that might be ready.

I call on the representative of Colombia.

**Mr. García** (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have a request concerning draft resolution L.11/Rev.1, which you mentioned among those upon which action will be taken tomorrow. Taking into account the fact that we are still conducting consultations, we would ask that the decision on that draft resolution be held in abeyance until Friday.

**The Chairman:** I would like to ask the representative of Colombia if L.11/Rev.1 will be ready tomorrow afternoon?

**Mr. García** (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This truly has been a process of complex consultations, and there remains one delegation that is still awaiting instructions on this. We would like to have the draft resolution adopted by consensus, and that is the reason for the delay. So, I cannot really say at this time whether we would have the necessary information tomorrow afternoon.

**The Chairman:** That is how costly democracy can be at times! Therefore, we will only take up four draft resolutions tomorrow: L.27/Rev.1, L.6, L.42 and L.36/Rev.1.

Now I would like to call on delegations wishing to exercise their right of reply. I call on the representative of Iraq.

**Mr. Al-Anbuge** (Iraq)(*interpretation from Arabic*): By an irony of fate, the Israeli representative is hurling accusations against my country that are fallacious and without foundation. It is particularly astonishing that these accusations are coming from a representative of an entity founded on aggression, expansion, occupation of the territories of others by force and by all illegal means.

To be honest, the last one entitled to speak in such a way is Israel, because everyone knows that that entity has a fearsome arsenal of nuclear weapons and stocks of other weapons of mass destruction that it uses to terrorize the States in the region. That entity has refused to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and refuses to place its nuclear installations under the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards system.

I should like to conclude my statement by citing a proverb: "People who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones".

**The Chairman:** We have heard the last speaker for this afternoon.

*The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.*